

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Brad Will, Chair

Date:

Thursday March 7, 2024

Time:

3:30-4:30

Location:

Trails Room, Memorial Union

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)
Amber Nickell (AHSS)
Emily Breit (BE)
David Schmidt (BE)
Sarah Broman Miller (Ed)
Sohyun Yang (Ed)
Arrica Braun (HBS)
Tanya Smith (HBS)
C.D. Clark (STM)
Todd Moore (STM)
Robyn Hartman (Lib)
Ginger Loggins (Senate)
Audrey Rymer (SGA)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

3:30 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Clark, Hartman, Miller, Rymer, Schmidt, and Yang. Moore served as proxy for Clark, and Smith served as proxy for Hartman and Yang. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:31 (1 minute) The minutes from the February 15 meeting were amended and approved.

3:32 (31 minutes) The committee considered a revised proposal for **HHP 310: A Critical Thinking Approach: Consumer Health** to satisfy the CORE 1.5 outcomes (critical thinking), and voted to ask the department, again, to **revise and resubmit** the proposal. The CORE rubric needs to be brought better in line with the outcomes. In the case of outcome 2, it must be clear that proficiency involves successfully subjecting the student's own argument to a significant objection and defending it from this objection. The department may also consider bringing in some of the language from the student-facing rubric.

4:03 (7 minutes) The committee considered a revised proposal for **HIST 105: Historical Roots of Contemporary Issues** to satisfy the CORE 1.5 outcomes (critical thinking), and when it was made clear that the proposed source-analysis paper could successfully assess the student's ability to systematically evaluate arguments of *various* kinds, **approved** the proposal.

4:10 (2 minutes) The committee considered a proposal for **MUS 261: Music in the Movies** to satisfy the CORE 2.1A outcomes (aesthetic mode of inquiry), and **approved** the proposal.

4:12 (14 minutes) The committee considered a revised proposal for **SOC 105: Thinking Critically about Sociology** to satisfy the CORE 1.5 outcomes (critical thinking). The committee voted to **approve** the proposal **contingent** upon changes being made to the CORE rubric, indicating with respect to outcome 1 an emphasis on systematically *evaluating* arguments (explaining why they are either good or bad), and indicating with respect outcome 2 an emphasis on setting out an argument and defending it from a significant objection. Chair will determine whether these conditions are met.

4:26 The meeting ended. Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday March 21, 3:30 PM, Trails Room.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

